



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HARKAVY "FESTSCHRIFT"

Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy aus Anlass seines am 20. November 1905 vollendeten siebenzigsten Lebensjahres . . .
herausgegeben von Baron D. v. GUENZBURG und I. MARKON.
(זכרון לאברהם אליהו). St. Petersburg 1908. pp. iii + 507 +
178 + iv, 8°.

DR. HARKAVY is one of the most prominent of Jewish scholars who, through untiring work, acute combinations, and fortunate finds, has contributed largely to the progress of Jewish scholarship, and is a master in many different branches of Jewish history and literature. He is since the death of Steinschneider perhaps the greatest authority in Jewish Arabic literature; there are very few who are equally well acquainted with the early history of the Jews in Poland; he has contributed very much to our knowledge of palæography, chronology, the Gaonic period, mediæval Hebrew poetry, Jewish sectarianism, and especially Karaitic literature. And the activity of the many-sided scholar is not even completely covered by these different branches, as a superficial glance over the 392 titles of his works and articles will show. They at the same time testify to the interest he has taken in many practical questions of contemporary life, as education, Haskala, and colonization of Palestine. Harkavy certainly has done his full share in the studies to which his life is devoted. We wish the venerable scholar a long and happy continuation of his useful and important activity.

The present Jubilee volume in his honor appears three years after the great scholar reached the age of seventy years. But this delay seems to have had very favorable consequences for the book, as it contains an unusual number of important contributions and takes a prominent place among the many similar publications we have seen during the last twenty-five years. Thirty-

eight scholars have contributed to the volume which is divided into a Hebrew part (quoted in the following as I) with 26 contributions, and a non-Hebrew part (II), containing eight articles in German, two in French, one in English, and one in Neo-Greek. The editors are to be congratulated that they did not limit the space of the single contributions so that it became possible to include lengthy studies like those of Bornstein and Poznański, and full editions of important texts like those by Bacher, Brody, and Israelsohn. Altogether, editions take a very prominent part in this volume, as in the literary activity of Harkavy. Almost every branch of Jewish literature is represented in the present volume. Bible, Hellenism, Talmud, and Midrash, as well as Gaonic and mediæval history and literature receive impartial attention.

The articles are preceded by a separately paged bibliography of Harkavy's writings (p. ix-lii). It is divided according to languages. Hebrew (148 nos., 56 books and series of articles, 81 articles in periodicals, and collective writings, and 11 additions to works of others); Russian (140 numbers of which 9 are separate books, and 17 additions to other works); German (86 to which No. 391 is to be added, which deals with R. Mubashshir, not Sefer ha-Galuy); French (11 nos.), and English (6 nos.). This collection of the dispersed articles of Harkavy's is of great value and will prove useful for the student as the contents of the articles are as a rule briefly indicated. Yet in a case like No. 101 a more detailed account of the contents of the article ought to have been given, though it might have become rather lengthy. The cross-references from one article to another have been added very carefully, where both deal with similar points. I only noticed that in No. 346 the reference to No. 8 is omitted. In the bibliography itself I would note a few omissions: After No. 67, כפתור ופרח 'ירושלים' in הערות לס', V, 363 = כפתור ופרח, 893, and after 75 הערות שונות in *Ha-Karmel*, VII, No. 11. After 319, *Erwiderung* in *Liter. Centralblatt*, 1876, pp. 964-6, against Chwolson's *Erklärung*, *ib.*, 737-38. After 377, Review of Petermann's Samaritan Grammar in *Revue Critique*, 1874, No. 5, pp. 65-67. It is peculiar that Harkavy's edition of Judah Halevi's poems (Warsaw 1894-5) is not mentioned. In the addition of the reviews of

Harkavy's works the bibliography naturally is not complete, e.g. Brüll's valuable reviews are never mentioned, cf. for No. 1 his *Jahrbücher*, V, 190-191; No. 3, *ib.*, 192-194; No. 4, *ib.*, IX, 123-128; No. 58, *ib.*, 167 f. (where a reprint of 9 pages is mentioned); No. 289, *ib.*, III, 128-131. The last number was also reviewed by P. F. Frankl, *MGWJ.*, XXV (1876), 418-427, and Riehm, *ZDMG.*, XXX, 336-343; No. 4 by I. Löw, *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für den Orient*, XII, No. 5, p. 98-99, and by Schorr in *החלוץ*, XIII, 47-93, where besides some scurrilous attacks, useful notes are found; No. 5 by Bacher, *REJ.*, XXIV, 307-318, XXV, 143-144; by Porges, *ib.*, 145-151; and by Neubauer, *JQR.*, IV, 490-494; for No. 10 cf. S. Fraenkel *JQR.*, XVI, 576-578. Yet these small omissions do not in any way take away from our obligation to the compiler of the bibliography, who had a very hard task before him, as every student who has done similar work will realize. Only in one general point could an improvement have been effected, which would have made this bibliography more useful. A Hebrew indication of the contents of the 140 Russian items would have made this list much more valuable to those who, like the present writer, are unacquainted with that language. This bibliography was compiled by D. Maggid and revised and completed by S. Poznański who, though not figuring on the title-page, seems to have taken the greatest share in editing the volume, as in the notes we meet with additions by him to many of the different articles.

The Hebrew part of the volume is opened by two biblical articles. Halévy contributes an essay on dramatic stories in the Bible (*ספורים תפעוליים בכתבי הקדש*, I, 1-16), dealing from this point of view with Job which he divides into 6 acts, the marriage of Hosea into 8 acts, the story of Jonah into 6 acts, I Kings 20, 35-43, and Canticles 2, 8-17. The late M. Friedmann gives his suggestive explanations *מאיר עין* on Hosea (I, 17-34). Apocryphal literature is represented by Israel Lévi's article *Le chapitre III de Ben Sira* (II, 1-5) opening the non-Hebrew part, and Chajes on the book of Judith (II, 105-111). Lévi points to the artificial and mechanical arrangement of Ben Sira, by putting 3, 1-15 opposite 3, 16-28 and showing that 1-12 correspond to 16-26, and that the verses 27-28 which have no connection with

the preceding, form a parallel to 13-15. Chajes puts together the evidence tending to show that the book of Judith was written in the Maccabæan period as a romance, with the purpose of encouraging the people. He believes that the name Judith was taken for the heroine in memory of Judas Maccabæus. Several passages mention the fact that the Temple had been lately cleaned and purified. The event which serves as a basis for the story of Judith and Holophernes, according to Chajes, is the defeat and death of Nicanor and he points to a number of interesting parallels between the account of I Maccabees 7, 26 ff., and the Book of Judith. Chajes, likewise, points to a few interesting haggadic parallels and tries to strengthen the theory of a Hebrew original by explaining two passages through mistakes in the Hebrew. Here his arguments are not very convincing.

To this period also belongs Kohler's essay on the Zealots (*Wer waren die Zeloten oder Kannaim?* II, 6-18), the patriotic Jewish party which Josephus so viciously misrepresents. Kohler puts the respective passages and sources together and discusses them.

Larger space is given to the early Jewish exegetes. In the first place, with regard to the early translations, Margolis, who has devoted much of his time to the study of the Septuagint, which has been rather neglected by Jewish scholars since the time of Frankel, gives a timely warning against the indiscriminate corrections of the Hebrew Bible on the basis of the Septuagint, the text of which in itself is often corrupt (מעיות סופרים בתרגום, I, 112-116). He points to the great number of variations which are merely corruptions of the text, and gives a number of instances in which only one MS. preserves the original text, while all others are corrupt or where the Septuagint in all of its MS. forms is faulty. It is very instructive to see (p. 113) what became of ἐγὼ σελίσια Jeremiah 48, 34 (Septuagint 31, 34) where the translator left the Hebrew עגלת שלישיה untranslated, or how the text of Judith 9, 3 is improved by a slight correction (p. 115 f.).

To another old translation, the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, Landauer has devoted his contribution (*Ein interessantes Fragment des Pseudo-Jonathan*, II, 19-26) con-

taining a fragment of this Targum on the decalogue Ex. 20, 1-13. What gives this text a peculiar interest is that it forms part of an Onkelos MS. One might think that originally this MS. contained some version of the Palestinian Targum in which the gaps were filled out by Onkelos, but the learned editor informs us that the other leaves of the MS. contain the text of Onkelos to 25, 31-28, 8, and in these chapters all versions of the Palestinian Targum offer some differences from the official text of Onkelos. Landauer compares the text with all other versions, and discusses its peculiarities in form and contents.

Two pieces are published here, by the earliest original interpreter of the Bible, Saadia, concerning whom we owe so much new information to Harkavy's discoveries. Eppenstein's edition of the double introduction to his commentary on Psalms (...סעריה רב שתי הקדמות, I, 135-160) and the longer commentary on the first four Psalms almost finishes the publication of Saadia's commentary on this book, which is found in seven dissertations, the eighth unfortunately not having been published as yet. Saadia's introduction was only known by a free German translation which the editor often corrected in his notes. Of Saadia everything ought to be published in the original, and the careful work of the editor will be accepted with satisfaction by all those interested in this many-sided and original Gaon.

The "Genizah-Fragment" (II, 91-94) from Elkan Adler's collection edited by the late Siegmund Fraenkel contains a leaf of Saadia's translation and commentary on Isaiah 20, 2 ff.; the commentary on the first verse is accompanied by a German translation.

A very valuable addition to the biblical studies of the classical Judeo-Arabic period of which relatively little has been published so far, are the contributions of Bacher and Israelsohn. Bacher's publication of the Arabic translation and commentary by Moses ha-Kohen Ibn Chiquitilla (...תרגום ערבי על ס' איוב עם ביאור ערבי, I, 221-272), as far as preserved in the Oxford MS. 125, is the more valuable as this is the first connected piece of the commentaries by this author that is published, Poznański in his monograph (Berlin 1895) having been able to collect only very few passages in the original Arabic among the 22 pages of

quotations (cf. also his additions *REJ.*, XLI, 45-61). Bacher establishes the authorship of Ibn Chiquitilla which Poznański had disputed. The MS. contains the works of two other authors, Saadia and an anonymous writer, besides Ibn Chiquitilla, and Bacher has used it for his excellent edition of Saadia's translation and commentary on Job and has published the anonymous piece in *JQR.*, XX, 31 ff. With the present publication, the whole MS. is completely edited. It does not unfortunately contain the complete translation and commentary of our author, but his translation of 600, and his commentary on 140, of 1070 verses. The translation is printed in larger type than the commentary; in an appendix the remnants of a third translation in the same MS. and a Hebrew translation of the short introduction are added to the edition.

His contemporary and antagonist, Ibn Bal'am, whose commentary on Jeremiah (פירוש על ס' ירמיה, I, 273-308) is published here for the first time by Israelsohn, is better known to us now since Steinschneider discovered a great part of his כתאב אלתרגומה on the Pentateuch (the title was first established by Neubauer in his *Report on the Petersburg Collection*, Oxford, 1876, 4), and since Harkavy found his almost complete commentary on the Prophets נכת אלמקרא, and fragments of that on the Hagiographa. This is the fourth book on which his commentary is now accessible, Derenbourg having edited the one on Isaiah (1892) and Poznański that on Joshua and Judges (1903-6), both from Israelsohn's copy. Poznański has promised an edition of the rest of Ibn Bal'am's works, the explanation of the Pentateuch especially deserving to be known in full, as its author shows a rare combination of talmudic learning and grammatical training. Israelsohn has based his text on two MSS. which supply each others' deficiencies and adds in the notes useful references to sources and parallels as well as the later authors who utilized the work. Israelsohn is well known to the scholarly world by his excellent edition of Ibn Ḥofni's Arabic commentary on the end of Genesis published 23 years ago, and it is to be hoped that he will now be able to return to this field of studies, in which he has shown himself so thorough.

The late Salomon Buber, the famous editor of Midrashim, gives some excerpts of a commentary on Genesis which bears the title "Midrash" because it consists mainly of a collection of aggadic passages: דונמאות מן מדרש על ס' בראשית לרבי שמואל בן רבי נסים מסנות (I, 391-402). There is no introduction to this contribution, owing probably to the death of Buber. The editors of the volume ought to have added at least the necessary references. Samuel b. Nissim Masnut is well known as the author of a commentary on Job under the title Majan Gannim published by the editor of the present specimens (Berlin 1889) from an Oxford MS. He also wrote a commentary on Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles contained in a Vatican MS., and according to Brüll (*Centralanzeiger*, p. 35) on Proverbs. Of the commentary on Genesis nothing was previously known. Buber identified the author originally with a Samuel ben Nissim mentioned by Ḥarizi as living in Aleppo, and it is a curious coincidence that he acquired the MS. of the present work from that city. Yet Neubauer (*JQR.*, II, 527; comp. Bacher *REJ.*, XXII, 135 f.) has proved that the author was a Sicilian who lived in Toledo. The date given by Neubauer (15th Century) is based on a mistake of Assemani, Masnut having lived a century earlier (cf. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Übersetzungen*, 851, n. 41). Bacher has given an excellent characterization of the author based on his commentary on Job (*REJ.*, XXI, 118-32). The excerpts published here do not add any new traits but simply give new examples of his method. As the twelve pages only cover the first two verses of Genesis, the whole work must be of considerable length. Buber adds the sources in his footnotes, and there are only few passages for which even this master of the Midrash could not trace the source (comp. notes 8, 16, 29, 78). Besides the sources used in his commentary on Job, מדרש חסר ויתיר (note 46) and Donnolo (note 80) are drawn upon. The additions of the author to the haggadic passages which he compiled, are not very numerous (notes 30, 42, 51, 57, 59, 79), but he sometimes combined different passages (note 62) and enlarged his texts (note 43). Of special interest are his quotations from the Targum. While he never mentions the name of Onkelos in his Majan Gannim, he here introduces

his Targum repeatedly with **ואמר אונקלוס** (notes 76, 88); besides **תרגום ירושלמי** (89, Genesis I, 2, different from known versions) he quotes **ת"ש** (77) that agrees with the fragmentary Targum, ed. Ginsburger (Berlin 1899), and adds another text from a **ג"א**. If the editor had lived to write an introduction he would probably have given more information about the Targum quotations in this work which seem to be very curious. He wrote to the present writer (Nov. 7, 1905) that he found in the MS. quotations from **ת"א = אחר תרגום** which do not refer to Onkelos, and **ת"ש = תרגום שני** which are neither in Pseudo-Jonathan nor in the fragmentary Targum. It would be worth while to examine carefully the quotations in the MS.

Lambert's contribution (**הביאורים הנמצאים בספר הלעזים**, I, 368-390) is a supplement to the splendid edition of the "Glossaire hébreu-français" which he published in 1904 in collaboration with Brandin. Lambert publishes here (p. 369-80) all the explanations to the Pentateuch and the five scrolls occurring in the MS. of the glossary, stating that these explanations are much more numerous on the other parts of the Bible, but that those presented are a fair specimen. These are followed by all the passages in which authors are quoted in the MS. (381-90). We do not get much new information, the quotations being mostly known from other sources. Yet this edition is valuable, showing the great influence of Menahem's dictionary (more than six of the ten pages of quotations are taken from it) even after the work of the Spanish school had become accessible to the author through the grammatical works of Ḥayyuj (it seems, in Ibn Chiquitilla's translation, comp. p. 388, l. 1, with ed. Nutt, p. 32 and ed. Dukes, p. 56), the dictionary of Parḥon, and the commentaries of Ibn Ezra. Next to him, Rashi is most often mentioned, other French commentators only very rarely. In the second part, the French glosses are added while they are omitted in the commentaries. We thus get some further specimens of the Hebrew spelling, while in the "Glossaire" only transliterations are given. This contribution leads us from exegetical to philological studies, to which the peculiar text belongs that is published by Παπαδοπουλος - Κεραμευς (II, 68-90), a Hebrew-Greek glossary to the Mishna forming part of the collection of the late

archimandrite Antonin, now in the Imperial Library at Petersburg. The leaf which is given in facsimile, contains almost the whole of כלאים and שביעית; the Greek equivalent is given opposite the Hebrew. It is perhaps desirable to add that, in the MS., the Greek is written in Greek, not in Hebrew letters. The editor devotes his attention in his Greek contribution to these glosses which he thoroughly discusses and declares to show a Cypriote dialect. The interest of this publication lies in the fact that we have no other documents of Greek-speaking Jews from the time from which this MS. dates. Leaving the Hellenistic literature out of account, we have only later translations of the Bible and liturgical poems.

A splendid piece of modern philological work is Immanuel Loew's essay on Aramaic names of snakes (II, 27-81). It is only part of a larger study. Loew gives some extracts of his material about the snake as a source of danger, as remedy, and in proverbs; then he discusses the general names for snakes and gives a full collection of all the forty names of snakes occurring in the different Aramaic literature including those Greek names that have been adopted (*Lehnwörter*) or transcribed into Aramaic (*Fremdwörter*). Loew shows here again as, in his "Aramäische Pflanzennamen," his remarkable acquaintance with Semitic as well as classic literatures, and his very wide reading. This contribution as well as his "Aramäische Fischnamen" published in "Orientalische Studien zu Ehren Noeldeke's" forms part of his long expected but not yet published Aramaic Zoology.

To archæology belongs an essay by Krauss (*Sklabenbefreiung in den jüdisch-griechischen Inschriften aus Südrussland*, II, 52-67) in which he discusses the manumission of slaves in the Judeo-Greek inscriptions of southern Russia, in a very interesting paper continuing the researches of Harkavy (היהודים ושפתם, *הסלאווים*, Wilna 1867, p. 77-97) and Derenbourg (*Notes Epigraphiques*, Paris, 1877, VI, 68-80). He discusses at length Levit. 27, 28 in the light of traditional references (comp. also D. Hoffmann's commentary *ad locum*), and the part of woman in the Temple services, and comes to the conclusion that possibly the consecration of the slave to the Synagogue is only a legal fiction for full manumission. For some points as the mention of heirs

and the remaining in Judaism, he might have found an interesting parallel in the deed of manumission of Fostat 1087 in the possession of Prof. Schechter, of which a facsimile is given in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, XI, 405. It reads: **בחמשה בשבה דהוא עשרין וחמשה יומין בירח אייר דשנת אלפא ותלת מאה ותשעין ושית שנין כמנינא דרגילנא ביה בפסטאט מצרים דעל נילוס נהרה מותבה אנא מדללה בת שלמה וכל שום דאית לי צביתי ברעות נפשי בד לא אניסנא אקנית לך נפשך לחירו אנת מכלוף וכל שום דאית לך דהות עבדי מן קדמת דנה וכדו שחרירית יתך וחורי[ר]יתיתך ושיתי יתך בן חורין הא את לעצמך הא את לנפשך ואית לך רשותא לשואה לך שם בישראל ולמיסב בת ישראל ולמעיל בקהלא דישראל כשאר חורוי ועלולי ולית לי רשותא ולא לירתאי בתראי ולא לכל דייתי מחמתי עלך ולא על בנך לשעבדא יתהון בשום מדעם ודן דיהוי לך מיני כתב שחרור ואגרת שבקין וגט חירותא כדת משה וישראל:**

אברהם ב"ר יצחק נ"ע
שלמה ביר' מבורך החבר נ"ע
צדקה בר נתנאל נ"נ
אברהם בר שלום נ"נ
משלם בר יפת נ"ע

The name of the lady who gave her slave freedom, **מדללה** (the spoiled one), is to be added to Steinschneider's list of Arabic names of Jews. Of the ceremony in the Synagogue mentioned in the Greek inscriptions there is no trace here. A formula for manumission is also contained in the Petersburg MS. of R. Hai's **דין כתאב תצניף בית דין** (IX, **חדשים גם ישנים**, Harkavy, this is missing in the Oxford MS. 2808; see Wertheimer, **גנוי ירושלים**, III, Intro. p. 3) and in the **ראב"ן** (ed. Prague, 1610, f. 140a) and elsewhere (cf. **נכסת הגדולה** to *Yoreh Deah*, Constantinople 1717, ch. 267, § 59-63).

For talmudic literature, in the first place, Ratner's study on the Baraita of Levi ben Sisi (**משנתושל לויבן סיס**), I, 117-22) is to be mentioned. Ratner collects the remnants of it, which are expressly mentioned as forming part of that collection (**תני לוי במתניתיה**). He shows that this was an independent work, not an explanation and amplification of the Mishna as Halevy maintains (**דורות הראשונים**, II, 60). He also shows that the work was unknown to the Palestinian Talmud. It is to be regretted that he

intentionally (p. 117) excluded those Baraitas of Levi in the Babylonian Talmud simply introduced by **תני לוי**, which would have made the article much more valuable and conclusive. In p. Baba Mešia (p. 119) one would rather correct **תני רבי לוי** in **תני רבי לוי** (not in **תני לוי**) as this requires only a very slight change. **תני לוי** I find also in p. Giṭṭin 5, 3 (46d). In Baba Batra 52b (p. 120) the Sheeltot 139 read like Sherira: **תני רב שרביא**; p. 120-121 Schorr (החלוץ, XIII, 7) also accepts the reading **תני רבי לוי** in p. Kilaim I, 6. In his notes on the latter passage **אהבת ציון וירושלים** (Wilna 1907), 8, ff., Ratner has previously discussed Levi's Baraitas.

Margulies gives some new explanations to difficult passages in the Palestinian Talmud Sabbath (הערות אחדות על ירושלמי שבת, I, 123-129).

Blau publishes four leaves of an unknown collection of Tosafot on Ketubot (עלים אחדים בלתי נודעים מתוספות למסכת כתובות, I, 357-367) found in the binding of a book, and proves that the author was Rabbi Isaac ben Samuel (ר"י הזקן). He then discusses the Tosafot on Ḳiddushin ascribed to this author in the Wilna edition of the Talmud, and proves that they are not his. Lubetzki, the editor of **ס' השלמה**, in his **ברקי בתים**, 16-22, recognized these Tosafot to be part of the **ספר השלמה**. The two discussions supplement one another. **בעל התשלום** on Nedarim (f. 24b 61b) is Naḥmanides, not the author of **ספר השלמה**; **ספר השלמה** is also quoted 64a and Lubetzki corrects 9a **בעל ש"ש** and 39a **בעל ה"ה** into **בעל השלמה**. French words also occur 13a, 31a; 28b Rabbi Samuel (Ben Meir) is quoted. References to his work on other treatises are also found, 29b on Moed Katon, 28a, 46a on Nedarim, on Ketubot, and Giṭṭin; also 12b, on Baba Batra 27b, and Niddah 13a. Such studies in the Tosafistic literature are not very frequently met with at present, but they are very useful throwing light on a literature which we only know in a later stage, and this is the only way in which we can find out the older strata.

Cowley's contribution deals with an earlier work on the Talmud, namely Samuel b. Ḥofni's Introduction to the Talmud (I, 161-163). He publishes the beginning of it, from a single leaf contained in the Bodleian, finally establishing the existence of this book. Prof. Schechter has discovered a large fragment

which he identified as the end of this work, and which he has kindly placed in my hands for publication. One will see from it that this introduction was on a much larger scale than that of Samuel Hanagid and that the latter may have utilized but certainly not translated it. The MS. of which Cowley gives the first leaf only contained an abridged text (מכתצר) and very closely agrees with the beginning of Samuel Hanagid's introduction. It is very peculiar that עקיבא ר' אותיות verso, l. 19, is mentioned as Baraita between Mekilta and Sifra, though it occurs also in Samuel Hanagid's work, where S. Sachs wanted to omit אותיות (see הפליט, pp. 43-44). Verso, l. 3-5, the source from which the gap is supplied ought to have been added (Eduyot 1, 6).

This introduction is one of the sources for the history of the Gaonic period and the Babylonian academies with which Epstein deals with his usual thoroughness (מקורות לקורות הגאונים וישיבות) (בבל, I, 164-174). He points for the first time to the difference between sources coming from Sura and those from Pumbaditha. From the latter academy we have only one historical work, but this belongs to the best historical sources in the whole Jewish literature, the letter of Sherira (which was translated into Hebrew, not edited according to a London MS., by Filipowski in the appendix to his edition of the יוחסין). One of the difficulties which Epstein finds, that R. Judah, Sherira's grandfather, who became Gaon in 906, should have been the secretary of a Gaon who died in 816, is easily solved. The MSS. of the Franco-German text of Sherira all have אבי נאון אבי אבינו i. e. R. Judah's grandfather, and not R. Judah himself. As we know from the letter JQR., XVIII, 402 (comp. 769), Judah was the secretary of R. Zemah b. Paltoi. In the other case (Sherira, p. 39) בן בני cannot be taken literally, but must mean descendant. (Comp. also Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 70-71.) Much more numerous, but also in a much worse state of preservation, are the sources coming from Sura, among which the Seder Tannaim we-Ammonaim takes the first place. The editions are more fully given in Steinschneider's "*Geschichtsliteratur*," § 11, and additions p. 173. About the close relations with a responsum of the Suran Gaon R. Amram comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 328-30, 305-8. That the date ל"תק for Rab's emigration to Babylon is a peculiarity of this

Suran source is very doubtful. Nissim in his *מפתח* 3a, has this date, and he in all probability followed the authority of Sherira's letter addressed to his father and so corroborates the evidence of all the MSS. Of R. Samuel b. Ḥofni's introduction to the Talmud (see above), unfortunately very little of historical value has come down to us. The first quotation discussed by Epstein does not belong to Samuel but to *ס' מתיבות* as shown elsewhere (see above p. 91). The second quotation occurs in a fuller form in some MSS. of Ibn Aḳnin's introduction; see *Ginse Nistaroth*, III, 107, and *MGWJ.*, 1875, 321. That the MS. Angelica 36 contains at the end of the *מבוא התלמוד* the passage about the privilege of Sura. Buber announced in *עברי אנכי*, XXII (1885, No. 13, p. 108), where he communicated some variations. I mentioned *ZfḥB.*, IX, 140, that the same is found in a MS. of the Seminary Library (formerly Cod. Halberstam 446). About Nathan ha-Babli, comp. also Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, and my review in *ZfḥB.*, XIII, 169-70. Epstein believes that his MS. was used by Shullam as the basis for his edition of Sherira and the anonymous *סדר הישיבות*. I have proved in *ZfḥB.*, V, 58, that Shullam used the text from which MS. Epstein was copied. A very interesting discovery Epstein made in Abraham b. David's *Sefer ha Ḳabbalah*. He shows that he utilized Suran sources for the earlier generations of the Geonim and only in the later times followed Sherira. All the discrepancies thus find their explanation.

To the Gaonic period to a large extent also belongs one of the most important contributions to the Jubilee-volume, viz: Poznański's collection of all the Kairwan scholars hitherto known (*אנשי קירואן*, I, 175-220). This summary of earlier and recent discoveries and publications will prove very helpful to all who are interested in the period of the decentralization of Jewish learning. Poznański begins with a survey of the Gaonic responsa known to be directed to Kairwan and practically all other references. The list consists of 45 names, several of which are only known as witnesses. I may supplement the additions already made by me in a review of the reprint of the essay in *ZfḥB.*, XIII, 74-5, by a few addenda:

About Abraham ibn Aṭa (No. 7) cf. now Dr. Davidson's interesting article in which the poem of Hai Gaon is reproduced

in a corrected form together with a new poem in honor of Ibn Aṭa who is identified with Abrahām b. Nathan (No. 6); above p. 231 ff., esp. p. 236. In corroboration of this identification Dr. Poznański in a letter to Dr. Davidson points to the fact that נתן is the Hebrew equivalent for the Arabic عتא.—P. 194 Ḥananel wrote also commentaries to other biblical books. In the פרושים שונים על ס' ישעיה ed. Halberstam, *Letterbode*, VII, explanations are quoted on Isaiah 6, 13; 10, 13; 21, 5; 31, 2; 40, 20; 41, 22; 42, 3, 8, 14; 43, 22; 45, 4, 16, 49, 1; 53, 2 (also in Neubauer, *The 53rd Chapter*, p. 335); 54, 1; 57, 16; 59, 15; 60, 19; 61, 1, 6; 63, 1; 65, 1; on Hosea 11, 10 *ib.* p. 34; quotations from other books may possibly occur in Cod. Paris 217.—P. 195 the laws of slaughtering by R. Ḥananel are quoted also by R. Judah b. Nathan in his new הלכות שהיטה MS. of the Seminary in New York (see *REJ.*, LIX, p. 221, note). To the four responsa of R. Ḥananel mentioned by Rapaport (התרומה ס' XVI, Ittur 8c, § 242, Azulai, שו"ר ברכה, שו"ר יוסף (Appendix to ברכי יוסף) to 205, ed. Leghorn, 1774, f. 210 b), Poznański adds a few more. Besides two in Ittur I 36c and 44c, I notice 11 in the הלכות MS. of the Seminary Library. Müller intended to publish these responsa as they were copied for him in Ramsgate (*Report of the Montefiore College*, 1893, 9-10). One of them, as Poznański points out (p. 196, note 1), is ascribed to Rashi in חופש מטמונים [and in פרדס f. 23c, ed. Warsaw, f. 59a].—About המקצועות ס' Zunz gave some important references in *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 252. Besides ס' אסופות, and מורכי, ראב"ה. R. Ephraim of Bonn ascribed it to R. Ḥananel (*JQR.*, III, 342). He also quotes it in Responsa of R. Meir of Rothenburg, ed. Lemberg, No. 318. For further contradictions between ס' המקצועות and R. Ḥananel comp. also Gross, *R. Elieser b. Joel Halevi*, p. 52, note 1. As proof for the German origin of the compilation P. might have referred to passages like that which R. Isaac b. Hayyim found in his grandfather's ש"ת ר' חיים אור זרוע No. 14, f. 7b and הפרנס 125). Gaonic quotations from המקצועות ס' (p. 197) also occur in אור זרוע on Baba Ḥamma No. 347, 373, 390.—P. 198. In החליץ, V, § 42-3, Schorr shows that R. Ḥananel sometimes follows the Palestinian Talmud against the Babylonian. *Ib.* note

1. In the only case in which R. Ḥananel says: **וכן קבלנו מרבינו** (on Sukkah 37b) the reading is rather doubtful. Ibn Ghiat I, p. 112, and Manhig, p. 69a, read instead **וכן קבלנו האב** which Bamberger in his notes to the former place refers to R. Ḥushiel: Meiri (**מנן אבות**, p. 144) had the reading **מאבותי**, while others like Ittur II, 40a, and **רא"ש** agree with the edition.—To the quotations from Hai Gaon in R. Ḥananel's commentaries p. 195, n. 1, Pesahim 107b is to be added. R. Ḥefez b. Jaziah, as Poznański points out, probably does not belong here, as there really are no proofs for his having been in Kairwan. In a letter which I hope to publish shortly in the *JQR*, the **כתב המצות למרב חפץ האלוף בן יצליה האשורי** is mentioned, which seems to indicate that he was a native of Mosul (?). According to the editor, the **מצות ס' המצות** quoted in **אשכול**, III, 61, is the work of R. Ḥefez, but compare Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 179. The **מצות ס' חפץ** quoted in **אשכול**, according to the introduction p. xx, cannot be found, nor does it occur in the MSS., as Mr. Albek informs me. For the **תפסיר אלא לפאט מפיטום הקטרת** cf. Kaufmann, *REJ.*, V, 315. The corrections offered p. 27, note 1, have already been given by Steinschneider in *MGWJ.*, XXXIV (1885), 288. The **סמ"ק** does not quote R. Ḥefez; the passage given by Poznański in confirmation of this is found in the **ליקוטים מרבינו מאיר מרוטנבורק** at the end of paragraph 82 (not 81), and is identical with **חשב"ץ** 412 mentioned immediately after it. To the collection of quotations from Sefer Ḥefez, 28, note 1, may be added Or Zarua, Baba Batra 99. Ephraim of Bonn (Resp. of R. Meir b. Baruch, ed. Lemberg, 318, mentioned here in the name of R. Meir), R. Meir b. Baruch (Resp. ed. Prague, No. 175, 307), Abraham ben Nathan (Manhig) 61a, 67a, **חפץ נאון** (comp. D. Cassel, *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, 131), **שבמ"ה** (Cod. British Museum Or. 1389, *MGWJ.*, IV (1853), 104); Mordecai also quotes it Ketubot IX, § 334; **סמ"נ** *Commandments*, No. 111, has a passage occurring also in **מתיבות ס'** and contradicting R. Ḥananel (cf. above p. 92). It ought to be mentioned that some of the excerpts in Or Zarua contain quotations of Gaonic responsa, e. g. Baba Ḳamma 281, 284; Baba Batra 78 = **חשב"ץ** 569, R. Meir b. Baruch Resp. 307; I 167a, § 615 and Baba Mešia 38, quotes the Pal. Talmud; Baba Ḳamma 381 contains a marginal note (**גליין**) of

Sefer Hefez.—P. 202, No. 22. For R. Judah ben Joseph see now Davidson (above p. 237, 244-46). He might be the son of the Joseph b. Judah (מ"ר יוסף בן אבי זכריא) mentioned as correspondent of Sherira and Hai in Beth Talmud, III, 64, but the parallel passage in Responsa of R. Solomon ben Adret, V, 121 (Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I 187) reads משה בן אבי שכם. A יוסף בן מר רב יהודה is quoted by Ibn Ghiat, II, 90.—P. 203, No. 24, in Cod. Oxford 2877⁹ Joseph and Nissim the sons of Berechiah occur; perhaps Joseph is the one discussed here. That Naḥshon was a brother of Joseph (p. 204) is also the opinion of Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IX 129.—P. 209, about Meborak comp. also Abr. Klausner, *Minhagim*, 9a, Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 192.—P. 212. R. Abraham b. Isaac אב"ר saw in Barcelona the מפתח of R. Nissim Resp. MS. No. 604, Gross, *MGWJ.*, 1868, 281; Sachs, כבוד הלבנון, VI, 167; ארחות חיים, I, 15b, § 28, quotes בעל המפתח. It is doubtful whether the מפתחות used by R. Shilah b. Isaac of Siponte (Iṭṭur I, 14c) is the work of Nissim.—P. 215. Responsa of R. Nissim are also quoted by Meiri (מנן אבות, 146-47) and Naḥmanides on Baba Batra 52b.—P. 216. On Nissim's Siddur see Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 19, note d, and the passages quoted there. Manhig 81b also quotes מנלה סתרים, but the references to the title are misplaced, comp. Zunz, *l. c.*, Cassel, *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, p. 132.

One of the Kairwan savants discussed by Poznański also occurs elsewhere in this volume. Goldziher publishes from the Arabic Genizah-Collection of the late David Kaufmann, a large fragment of a treatise on the names and attributes of God (*Ein anonymen Traktat zur Attributenlehre*, II, 95-114), which is dedicated to Abraham ibn Aṭa, a physician to whom high praise is given and whom he identifies with the Kairwan correspondent of R. Hai. The passage in question is translated into German, p. 99, and shows that the author lived far away from Ibn Aṭa; the latter showed great interest in the academies and helped support them. The editor therefore suggests that the anonymous writer lived in Babylonia. He was evidently a contemporary of Hai and his work belongs to the earliest philological writings among the Jews coming immediately after Saadia, so far as is

known at present. The author, as Goldziher points out, belongs to the school of the Mutazilites.

Passing from philosophy to theology, Grünhut (I, 403-413) deals with a book which must have enjoyed very great popularity as there are at least 20 MSS. of it known, the **מראות אלהים** by R. Ḥanok b. Salomon al-Ḳonstantini (cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Berlin*, II, 97, No. 2051). Yet it is very little quoted; Grünhut only knows of its use and abuse by Abrabanel. How this enhances the value of the book (p. 410) is hard to understand. That Abrabanel sometimes made use of the book without mentioning it, is a fresh example of his well known method of treating his sources. Besides some quotations in his *Alfarabi* (see index *s. v. Chanoch*) Steinschneider gave a note of the book in *HB.*, XII, 108-109, analyzing the introduction of which Grünhut offers fuller extracts. Besides the authors put together, p. 403, the work is also mentioned by Heilprin in his *Seder ha-Dorot* and De Rossi in his biographical dictionary. On the **מנלה עמוקות** of Solomon al-Ḳonstantini (p. 409) cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Berlin*, II, 62-3, Cod. 211-12, who states that according to the Vatican MS. this book was finished **בסלו** 113 (1352) in **ברנש**, probably Burgos. Steinschneider also believes this Solomon to be the father of Ḥanok. On the family of al-Ḳonstantini, cf. Steinschneider in *JQR.*, XII, 205-8.

Mediaeval Hebrew poetry is well represented in the present volume by a contribution by Brody, the best authority on this subject (**מטמני מסתרים מחברת ב': ס' הענק לר' יהודה אלחרזי**, I, 309-56). He publishes the **ענק** of Ḥarizi from the unique Oxford MS. The author in all probability is the famous poet of the *Taḥkemoni*, the previous doubts of the editor having been removed. The poem is like the **ענק** of Moses ibn Ezra, a play with homonyms, several verses always ending with the same word in different meanings. The author, as Brody points out, avoids all those homonyms utilized by Moses ibn Ezra and the anonymous poet of whose work Brody has published a considerable fragment in *Haḳedem*, II, and therefore only seldom is able to give more than two verses finishing with the same word. The editor gives the meter before each of the 257 groups of verses and on the bottom of the page adds the necessary refer-

ences to the text which gives new evidence of the poetical talent of the great Spanish poets.

Markon's description of the ritual of Kaffa in the Crimea (מאמר על אדות מחזור מנהג כפא, I, 449-469) with a list of the religious poets and poems it contains is also a useful contribution to the history of Hebrew poetry. I have dealt with this more fully elsewhere (*OLZ.*, XII, 448-9).

Steinschneider's contribution (*Zeitgenossen des Moses ibn Esra und Jehuda ha-Levi*, II, 126-136) which was written at very short notice half a year before the death of the great master, gives a list of all the contemporaries (104) that occur in the works of Moses ibn Ezra and Judah ha-Levi, who formed a kind of literary circle which deserved a special investigation with attention to the non-Jewish surroundings. In the suggestive introduction which in no way shows the advanced age of the writer, Steinschneider points to four other similar circles of poets, one in Provence towards the end of the 14th Century, one in northern Spain in the 15th Century, one in Salonica 1570-90, and finally one in Yemen in the 17th Century.

Another historical communication is, strange to say, almost the only one in the volume dealing with Harkavy's favorite subject of Karaism. Gottheil publishes "A Decree in favor of the Karaites of Cairo dated 1024," (II, 115-125) the oldest document in the archives of that community. Unfortunately the beginning of the text is missing and therefore not everything is clear. No names occur in the part preserved and the cause for granting the present decree to protect the Karaites against interference by their opponents can only be inferred. The text has been published before in an entirely unknown Karaitic journal *At-Tahdib* appearing in Cairo 1901-5. Gottheil has also published a later but more extensive Karaitic document from the same source in *The Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of Harper* (p. 386-414) and a Rabbinical document of the Eleventh Century in *JQR.*, XIX, 472-8. Jewish documents from Cairo of this period are not as rare as Gottheil believes (p. 117), as one can see, e. g., by glancing through Worman's instructive article in *JQR.*, XVIII, 7 ff.

A document which throws light on the conditions of the Polish Rabbis and communities in the 18th Century, is reprinted by Freimann from an extremely rare booklet (ס' תקע שופר, I, 414-442). It is a protest of Jēhizkīah Joshua Feibel Teomim against the congregation of Przemyśl, which had taken away his rabbinate in spite of the protests of the Council of the Four Lands and other authorities, and the obligations they had towards him. The editor gives all the necessary information in the introduction and notes. Comp. also *ZfHB.*, XIII, 66-68.

A letter of considerable significance for the history of the founder of Ḥasidism (לקורות החסידות... I, 443-448) is published by his latest biographer Abraham Kahana who discusses all the points of interest. It is written by a brother-in-law of Israel Baal Shem Tob in 1747 from Hebron, and speaks of conditions there and in Jerusalem.

Jaré gives some biographical dates about Ḥananel Nepi, לקוטים (מכתבי הרב חננאל ניפי, I, 470-83), some specimen of his halakic correspondence, and some notes from the MS. of his well-known biographical dictionary that was published miserably and with many omissions, the most notable of which is the biography of Azariah de Rossi, published here by Jaré with some other passages. Ghirondi, it seems, had omitted this biography purposely as he objected to the critic (see the forthcoming edition of Steinschneider's *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 25).

The letters of Rapaport, Jost, S. Sachs, Bodek, and Lebensohn to Reggio published by Berliner (דובב שפתי ישנים, I, 484-504), give some side-lights to the history of Jewish science in 1830-45 and the difficulties the editors of periodicals encountered at the time. Rapaport's letters deal to a great extent with his relations to the over-sensitive Luzzatto who could not be induced to put his attacks on Maimonides and Ibn Ezra in a milder form, and only with difficulty agreed to omit some love-poems of Moses Ibn Ezra "which were of such kind that even Gentiles would blame us for them." On the whole we do not get much new information out of these letters, as they deal with conditions that are well-known from the published correspondence of Luzzatto, Rapaport, etc., yet they add some new traits to the picture and one is glad to read once more, e. g., of the rôle the bookseller

Schmid in Vienna played as a mediator between the Italian and the Austrian and German scholars.

Lewin contributes an essay on the Jews of Kalisch (*Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Juden in Kalisch*, II, 141-178) where a Jewish community is mentioned as early as 1287. After putting briefly together all that is known of the political relations of this community, Lewin enumerates all the rabbis of this city in chronological order from 1647 to 1903, adding all necessary information about their literary activity. An alphabetical list of other prominent men of Kalisch, rabbis in other communities, scholars, physicians, printers, etc., concludes this contribution to the history of the Jews in Poland.

Schwab who in his valuable "*Rapport*" of 1904 had given a full collection of all Jewish epitaphs found in France, adds a new inscription found in Paris after the publication of his "*Rapport*" ("*Une Épitaphe Parisienne inédite*," II, 137-140). He approximately fixes the date at the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th Century for palæographical reasons. As such stones were often carried away from their places and used for buildings, it seems rather hazardous to venture the hypothesis that the single stone found in the foundation of a house should prove the existence of a third cemetery in Paris.

One of the most suggestive essays contained in the present volume is Bornstein's study on the Calendar in the Assuan Papyri (פליטה מני קדם, I, 63-104). Bornstein who is a specialist on the very complicated history of the Jewish calendar submits all the dates occurring in these papyri to a thorough investigation which leads him to supply some of the lacunae differently from the editors. Thus he reads in B 17th of Tot, instead of 7th; in D, 21st of Masora instead of first; in G 24 of Tishri (לחשירי), in I, 9th Year of Darius instead of 8th on the basis of his calculations and with comparison of the facsimiles. He shows his familiarity with all the most recent researches in the chronology of the Oriental peoples which he utilizes. He reaches the conclusion that the fixing of the calendar in the time of the papyri took place in the same way as the Talmudic literature, observation being checked to some degree by calculation. In an appendix, Bornstein discusses the expression יום עבורו של חדש which,

according to his opinion, the Palestinians understand to mean the 31st day of the month, the Babylonians the 30th; the intercalations of the Babylonians, the Karaitic views on determining the length of the month, etc. Incidentally it may be mentioned that, p. 100, note 1, Bornstein corrects the text of Maimonides' commentary on Mishna Rosh hashana II קצת חשבון קצת הראיה into קשת, which literally agrees with the Arabic original (*Hildesheimer-Jubelschrift*, p. 99), אלויה, קום מקדאר, while the editor, M. Friedlaender, incorrectly translates קצת שיעור הראיה.

Another article dealing with questions of calendar is that of Sarsowski about the Canaanitic names of the months in their relations to the Babylonians (שמות החדשים הכנענים ביחוסם להבבלים), II, 35-62) an Assyriological study which is entirely outside of the line of the reviewer. A lengthy account of the article may be found in *OLZ.*, 511-15.

There remains only to be mentioned Baron Günzburg's essay (II, 130-134), of a more miscellaneous character than the rest of the volume, but the title of which, והנה טוב מאד, might be well applied to the whole of the collection.

Jewish Theological Seminary
of America

ALEXANDER MARX